



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,174	06/14/2001	William Kress Bodin	AUS920010463US1	8001
34533	7590	09/24/2004	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (BLF) c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP 504 LAVACA STREET, SUITE 970 AUSTIN, TX 78701-2856			PATEL, HARESH N	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2154		

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/882,174	BODIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Haresh Patel	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-66 are presented for examination.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-66 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of copending Application No.09/881915. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitations of independent claims 1, 23, 45 are similar to claim 1 of copending Application No. 09/881915. The limitations "implementation using a transcoding gateway containing digital content" is equivalent to the use of digital content information by transcoding gateway to stream digital content. The use of e-mail containing fields of information (i.e., email mechanism) is well known in the art (for example, Microsoft outlook, specification, paragraph 6). The limitations of dependent claims 2-22, 24-44, 46-66, are similar to claims 2-12 of copending Application No. 09/881915.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1-66 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-15 of copending Application No.09/881919. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitations of independent claims 1, 23, 45 are similar to claim 10 of copending Application No. 09/881919. The limitation “implementation using a transcoding gateway containing digital content” is equivalent to the use of a content server through which digital content is transcoded into streams of multimedia data, the streams communicated via network to client devices, use of the digital content for streaming, use of remote director instructions comprising hyperlinked URLs invoked through a network-capable device. The use of e-mail containing fields of information (i.e., email mechanism) is well known in the art (for example, Microsoft outlook, specification, paragraph 6). The limitations of dependent claims 2-22, 24-44, 46-66, are similar to claims 11-15 of copending Application No. 09/881919.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 1-66 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No.09/881917. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not

patently distinct from each other because the limitations of independent claims 1, 23, 45 are similar to claim 1 of copending Application No. 09/881917. The limitation "implementation using a transcoding gateway containing digital content" is equivalent to the use of streaming digital content from a multiplicity of sources of digital information to a multiplicity of client devices, use of network of digital computers comprising a content server. The use of e-mail containing fields of information (i.e., email mechanism) is well known in the art (for example, Microsoft outlook, specification, paragraph 6). The limitations of dependent claims 2-22, 24-44, 46-66, are similar to claims 2-20 of copending Application No. 09/881917.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. Claims 1-66 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of copending Application No.09/882173. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patently distinct from each other because the limitations of independent claims 1, 23, 45 are similar to claim 1 of copending Application No. 09/882173. The limitation "implementation using a transcoding gateway containing digital content" is equivalent to the use of remote direction of streaming digital content from a multiplicity of sources of digital information to a multiplicity of client devices upon a network of digital computers comprising a content server receiving digital content from the sources and the digital content having a multiplicity of digital formats. The use of e-mail containing fields of information (i.e., email mechanism) is well known in the art (for example, Microsoft outlook, specification, paragraph 6). The limitations of

dependent claims 2-22, 24-44, 46-66, are similar to claims 2-11 of copending Application No. 09/882173.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

*Specification*

6. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The present title is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter.

7. The disclosure is objected. Some of the informalities are:

- i. The "BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION" section should contain brief description of the disclosed subject matter rather repetitive claimed language of the claims.
- ii. Unless the invention is created from scratch, applicant needs to provide all the prior arts that have led to the invention, i.e., existing patents and publications related to the claimed subject matter. In response, applicant is requested to provide the title, citation and copy of each publication related to the claimed subject matter. For each publication, please provide a concise explanation of that publication's contribution to the description of the prior art.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Objections***

8. Claims 17, 18, 46-66, are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 17 mentions that “The method of claim 17”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The method of claim 16”.

Claim 18 mentions that “The method of claim 17”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The method of claim 16”.

Claim 46 mentions that “The computer software product of claim 23”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The computer software product of claim 45”.

Claim 47 mentions that “The computer software product of claim 23”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The computer software product of claim 45”.

Claim 48 mentions that “The computer software product of claim 25”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The computer software product of claim 47”.

Claim 49 mentions that “The computer software product of claim 25”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The computer software product of claim 47”.

Claim 50 mentions that “The computer software product of claim 23”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The computer software product of claim 45”.

Claim 51 mentions that “The computer software product of claim 23”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The computer software product of claim 45”.

Claim 52 mentions that “The computer software product of claim 23”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The computer software product of claim 45”.

Claims 53, 59, 60, 63-66, mentions that “The computer software product of claim 23”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The computer software product of claim 45”.

Claims 54-58 mentions that “The computer software product of claim 31”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The computer software product of claim 53”.

Claims 61 and 62 mentions that “The computer software product of claim 38”, which is incorrect. For examine purpose, examiner considers it as “The computer software product of claim 60”.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-10, 13, 15-18, 23-32, 35, 37-40, 45-54, 57, 59-62, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Application Server Solution Guide, Enterprise Edition: Getting Started, Nusbaum, May 2000, Nusbaum et. al., pages 1-45, 416-434 (Hereinafter Nusbaum) in view of Java Media Framework API Guide, JMP 2.0 FCS, November 19, 1999, Sun Microsystems, page 1-66, 109- 135, 173-178 (Hereinafter Sun1) in further view of JavaMail API Design Specification, Version 1.1, Sun Microsystems, August 1998, pages 1-21, 41-50, 55-60 (Hereinafter Sun2).

11. As per claims 1, 23, 45, Nusbaum teaches a method, system and a software product to implement an email administration in a transcoding gateway (e.g., use of application server, title), the transcoding gateway comprising client device records stored in computer memory (e.g., Java Server pages containing client information, section 1.4, page 13), each client device record representing a client device (e.g., Java Server pages containing client information, section 1.4, page 13),

the transcoding gateway further comprising at least one file system (e.g., figure 8, page 8),

each file system further comprising file system storage locations and each file system storage location having a path name (e.g., section 1.4.1, page 16),

handling a digital object into a digital file having a digital format and a file name (e.g., section 1.2, page 1, section 2.1.1.1, pages 31 and 32),

downloading the digital file to a destination client device at an internet address recorded in an internet address field of a client device record (e.g., section 1.2, page 1, section 7.4, page 375, section 1.2, page 2, section 8.1.10.1, page 420),

recorded in the client device record's digital file format code field (e.g., section 1.2, page 1, section 2.1.1.1, pages 31 and 32), a digital file format code indicating that the client device represented by the client device record is capable of receiving the digital format of the digital file (e.g., format specified by the servlet based on the receiving client/server device supported formats, section 1.2, page 1, section 2.1.1.1, pages 31 and 32).

However, Nusbaum does not specifically mention about streaming digital content and transcoding a digital object with a digital format.

Sun1 teaches streaming digital content and transcoding a digital object with a digital format. (e.g., transcoding the video contents, page 33, streaming media, page 4, MPEG, JPEG, etc., video formatted content, page 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nusbaum with the teachings of Sun1 in order to facilitate transforming of the digital objects and using the digital formats for streaming digital objects. The well-known concept of handling transforming of the digital objects and using the digital formats for streaming digital objects would be supported by the gateway/server of the Nusbaum. The Nusbaum's gateway/server would help transform / transcode information of the objects/information that are used for streaming. Any digital data can be used for transforming and can be used for streaming using various known streaming digital formats, as per Sun1's teachings.

However, Nusbaum and Sun1 does not specifically mention about the handling of e-mails. Sun2 teaches receiving an email message (e.g., use of JavaMail API, page 1), the email message having destination mailbox address and object (e.g., figure 10-1, chapter 10, page 55, parts of internet mail), and the e-mail information having mailbox address field, a mailbox address identical to the destination mailbox address of the email message (e.g., figure 10-1, chapter 10, parts of internet mail, page 55), an internet address field (e.g., address field, parts of internet mail, page 55), a file format code field (e.g., format field, parts of internet mail, page 55), and a path name field (e.g., path name field, parts of internet mail, page 55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nusbaum and Sun1 with the teachings of Sun2 in order to

facilitate transcoding of the objects carried by the e-mail message. The well known concept of handling e-mail messages including any attachment information would be helpful to provide digital objects/information to the gateway/server of the Nusbaum. The Nusbaum's gateway/server would help transform / transcode information of the objects/information that are attached to the e-mails. Different fields of e-mail message would help provide different information, including source and destination addresses, files names, file path information, data location information, format information, as per Sun2's teachings.

12. As per claims 2, 24, 46, Nusbaum teaches recording a multiplicity of client device records representing a multiplicity of client devices (e.g., Java Server pages containing several client's information, section 1.4, page 13).

However, Nusbaum does not specifically mention about handling e-mail related information. Sun2 teaches a mailbox address and an internet address where the client is to be found on an internet (e.g., use of JavaMail API, page 1), a file format code identifying a file format that the client device is capable of receiving (e.g., figure 10-1, chapter 10, page 55, parts of internet mail), and a path name identifying a location in a file system where files for each client device are to be stored (e.g., path name field identifying file storage location, parts of internet mail, page 55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nusbaum and Sun1 with the teachings of Sun2 in order to facilitate transcoding of the objects carried by the e-mail message. The well known concept of handling e-mails related information including any attachment information would be helpful to

provide digital objects/information to the gateway/server of the Nusbaum. The Nusbaum's gateway/server would help transform / transcode information of the objects/information that are attached to the e-mails. Different fields of e-mail message would help provide different information, including source and destination addresses, files names, file path information, data location information, format information, as per Sun2's teachings.

13. As per claims 3-5, 25-27, 47-49, Nusbaum teaches the claimed limitations rejected under claims 1, 23 and 45.

However, Nusbaum does not specifically mention about the further details of claims 3-5, 25-27, 47-49. It is well known in the art to handle e-mail message implemented using standard email protocols, like, SMTP and POP3, for example, Sun2 teaches standard email protocols, SMTP and POP3 (e.g., paragraph 3, page 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nusbaum and Sun1 with the teachings of Sun2 in order to facilitate transcoding of the objects carried by the e-mail message. The well known concept of handling e-mails using SMTP and POP3 protocols including any attachment information would be helpful to provide digital objects/information to the gateway/server of the Nusbaum. The Nusbaum's gateway/server would help transform / transcode information of the objects/information that are attached to the e-mails. Different protocols would help e-mail message to be sent from one device to another device, as per Sun2's teachings.

Art Unit: 2154

14. As per claims 6-8, 28-30, 50-52, Nusbaum teaches the claimed limitations rejected under claims 1, 23 and 45.

Nusbaum also teaches the file name includes a file name extension identifying the digital format of the digital file (e.g., use of servlet, URL, specifying file extension, section 7.4, page 375),

each client device represented by a client device record comprises automated computing machinery (e.g., use of servlet, URL, and Enterprise Java Beans, section 1.2, page 1, section 7.4, page 375), a web browser (e.g., use of servlet, URL, and Enterprise Java Beans, section 1.2, page 1, section 7.4, page 375), and an internet client having an internet address (e.g., use of servlet, URL, and Enterprise Java Beans, section 1.2, page 1, section 7.4, page 375),

the downloading is carried out by use of HTTP (e.g., use of HTML section 1.2, page 2, section 8.1.10.1, page 420).

15. As per claims 9, 31, 53, Nusbaum teaches storing digital file in a file system location having a digital file path name identical to a path name recorded in a path name field in a client device record (e.g., servlet utilizing URL information containing path name information for storage, section 1.2, page 1, section 7.4, page 375),

encoding the digital tile path name and the file name of the digital file into an HTML document having a conventional file name (e.g., use of EJB for conversion, page 32, section, 2.1.1.1) wherein downloading the digital file to the client device further comprises downloading the HTML document (e.g., downloading HTML documents, section 1.2, page 2, section 8.1.10.1, page 420).

However, Nusbaum and Sun1 does not specifically mention about handling e-mails related information. Sun2 teaches mailbox address field and a mailbox address (e.g., figure 10-1, chapter 10, page 55, parts of internet mail) equal to the mailbox address of the email message (e.g., use of JavaMail API to link mailbox address field and a mailbox address equal to the mailbox address of the email, page 1, chapter 10, page 55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nusbaum and Sun1 with the teachings of Sun2 in order to facilitate transcoding of the objects carried by the e-mail message. The well known concept of handling e-mails related information including any attachment information would be helpful to provide digital objects/information to the gateway/server of the Nusbaum. The Nusbaum's gateway/server would help transform / transcode information of the objects/information that are attached to the e-mails. Different fields of e-mail message would help provide different information, including source and destination addresses, files names, file path information, data location information, format information, as per Sun2's teachings.

16. As per claims 10, 13, 32, 35, 54, 57, Nusbaum teaches the claimed limitations rejected under claims 9, 31 and 53.

Nusbaum also teaches encoding the digital file path name and the file name of the digital file into an HTML document further comprises encoding a URL in a hyperlink in an HTML document (e.g., use of Enterprise Java Beans to encode using servlet and URL information, section 7.4, page 375), storing the HTML document in the file system location identified by the

path name (e.g., use of Enterprise Java Beans to encode using servlet and URL information, section 7.4, page 375).

17. As per claims 15-18, 37-40, 59-62, Nusbaum teaches the claimed limitations rejected under claims 1, 23 and 45.

However, Nusbaum and Sun1 do not specifically mention about the further details of claims 15-18, 37-40, 59-62. It is well known in the art to handle e-mail message implemented using standard email protocols, like, POP and POP3, for example, Sun2 teaches posting the email message to a destination mailbox at the destination mailbox address and delivering the email message from the destination mailbox to an email client by using a standard email protocol / POP / POP3 (e.g., use of standard email protocols, SMTP and POP3, paragraph 3, page 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nusbaum and Sun1 with the teachings of Sun2 in order to facilitate transcoding of the objects carried by the e-mail message. The well known concept of handling e-mails using SMTP and POP3 protocols including any attachment information would be helpful to provide digital objects/information to the gateway/server of the Nusbaum. The Nusbaum's gateway/server would help transform / transcode information of the objects/information that are attached to the e-mails. Different protocols would help e-mail message to be sent from one device to another device, as per Sun2's teachings.

18. Claims 11, 12, 14, 33, 34, 36, 55, 56, 58, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over, Nusbaum in view of Sun1 and Sun2 and in further view of Carter et al,

"Method and apparatus for automatic conversions for electronic mail to an internet web site", US 2002/0105545 A1, August 8, 2002 (Hereinafter Carter).

19. As per claims 11, 12, 14, 33, 34, 36, 55, 56, 58, Nusbaum, Sun1 and Sun2 teaches the claimed limitations rejected under claims 9, 31 and 53.

However, Nusbaum, Sun1 and Sun2 do not specifically mention about the further details of claims 11, 12, 14, 33, 34, 36, 55, 56, 58. It is well known in the art, for example, Carter teaches the conventional file name being index.html and index.htm (e.g., Apache configuration file contents, page 13, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nusbaum, Sun1 and Sun2 with the teachings of Carter in order to facilitate transcoding of the objects carried by the e-mail message. The well known concept of handling e-mails related information including any attachment information would be helpful to provide digital objects/information to the gateway/server of the Nusbaum. The Nusbaum's gateway/server would help transform / transcode information of the objects/information that are attached to the e-mails. The conventional file names can be index.html and index.htm, as per Carter's teachings.

20. Claims 19, 41, 63, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over, Nusbaum in view of Sun1 and Sun2 and in further view of Wenocur et al, US 2003/0009694, A1, Jan., 9, 2003 (Hereinafter Wenocur).

21. As per claims 19, 41, 63, Nusbaum, Sun1 and Sun2 teaches the claimed limitations rejected under claims 1, 23 and 45.

However, Nusbaum, Sun1 and Sun2 do not specifically mention about the further details of claims 19, 41, 63. It is well known in the art, for example, Wenocur teaches the destination client device is an audio player and the digital format of the digital file is MP3 (e.g., paragraph 124, col., 12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nusbaum, Sun1 and Sun2 with the teachings of Wenocur in order to facilitate transcoding of the objects carried by the e-mail message. The well known concept of handling e-mails related information including any attachment information would be helpful to provide digital objects/information to the gateway/server of the Nusbaum. The Nusbaum's gateway/server would help transform / transcode information of the objects/information that are attached to the e-mails. The digital formats that can be carried by the e-mails and can be transformed could be MPEG, JPEG, GIF format, respective to the handling device, as per Wenocur's teachings.

22. Claims 20-22, 42-44, 64-66, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over, Nusbaum in view of Sun1 and Sun2 and in further view of Killcommons et al, 6,424,996 (Hereinafter Killcommons).
23. As per claims 20-22, 42-44, 64-66, Nusbaum, Sun1 and Sun2 teaches the claimed limitations rejected under claims 1, 23 and 45.

However, Nusbaum, Sun1 and Sun2 do not specifically mention about the further details of claims 20-22, 42-44, 64-66. It is well known in the art, for example, Killcommons teaches

Art Unit: 2154

the destination client device is a video player and the digital format of the digital file is MPEG (e.g., col., 8, lines 46 – 66), a digital picture frame and the digital format of the digital file is JPEG (e.g., col., 8, lines 46 – 66), a digital picture frame and the digital format of the digital file is GIF (e.g., col., 8, lines 46 – 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nusbaum, Sun1 and Sun2 with the teachings of Killcommons in order to facilitate transcoding of the objects carried by the e-mail message. The well known concept of handling e-mails related information including any attachment information would be helpful to provide digital objects/information to the gateway/server of the Nusbaum. The Nusbaum's gateway/server would help transform / transcode information of the objects/information that are attached to the e-mails. The digital formats that can be carried by the e-mails and can be transformed could be MPEG, JPEG, GIF format, respective to the handling device, as per Killcommon's teachings.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is 703-605-5234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

September 3, 2004

JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

  
JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100